

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No. 09/810,988	Applicant(s) SCHEUCH ET AL.	
	Examiner CLINTON OSTRUP	Art Unit 3771	

All Participants:

(1) CLINTON OSTRUP.

(2) MEGHAN VAN LEEUWEN.

Date of Interview: 26 January 2010

Status of Application: Amended

(3) _____.

(4) _____.

Time: 11:30am+/-

Type of Interview:

☒ Telephonic

☐ Video Conference

☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description: _____.

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

None

Claims discussed:

Independent claims 25, 43, & 44

Prior art documents discussed:

Brand et al. (6,606,989)

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

/Clinton Ostrup/
Examiner, Art Unit 3771

/Justine Yu/
Supervisory Patent Examiner

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed:
Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner called Ms. Van Leeuwen and informed her that he was trying to get the application in condition for allowance; however, the drawings were unacceptable as figure 3 had shading that made the figure unclear and box 12 had non-English writing. The examiner informed Ms. Van Leeuwen that the drawing must accurately reflect the currently claimed subject matter and it was agreed that a flow chart would suffice as a way to show the currently claimed subject matter in a figure. Ms. Van Leeuwen said she would contact her client and get back to the examiner by close of business 1/27/2010. Ms. Van Leeuwen called the examiner back at approximately 11:45am on 1/26/2010 and asked the examiner to send out an Ex Parte Quayle Action. .